

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his consideration of the previously amended claims, and for the detailed remarks provided in the instant Office Action. Applicant submits the following remarks in response, and respectfully imposes on the Examiner for his further review and comments.

35 USC §103(a)

In the instant Office Action, independent claim 1 is rejected under §103(a) over the combination of Bouchard et al. (US 6,842,186), Goldstein (US 2002/0069078), Gresky (US 5,914,473), and Kawamura et al. (US 6,249,301).

Applicant refers, in particular, to the Examiner's use of Gresky in which it is asserted that Gresky, when combined with Bouchard, will provide information to an apparatus to print a desired image. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion for the following reasons.

Gresky describes a method for scanning barcodes of bulky items for the purpose of checking out (i.e. purchasing) the bulky items (Abstract; also col. 3, lines 19 - 40). Gresky describes that a scan card having a bar code is used to identify to the register 28 the item to be billed.

Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of the above teaching of Gresky, with the combination of Bouchard et al., Goldstein, and Kawamura et al., would result in an invention in which a scan card have a bar code is scanned at the time of checkout to identify to a register what item is to be billed.

The above arrangement is in contrast to the invention of claim 1, in which an identifier is scanned to indicate the kind of wallpaper that should be printed/made. The step of scanning occurs before any consideration of billing/checkout it made.

Importantly, the identifier scanned in Gresky at the time of checkout does not identify a product/wallpaper to be made/printed. At the time Gresky scans the identifier, the product in question has already been made, and the scanning is merely for the purpose of identifying the already made product for appropriate billing/checkout.

Applicant considers the above difference to substantially distinguish the method of claim 1 over the cited combination, and respectfully seeks the Examiner's further consideration and comment thereon.

Applicant looks forward to word of further official communication in due course.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook



Tobin Allen King



Janette Faye Lee

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia
Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762